

<p align="center">Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</p>	<p>Application No. 10/575,489</p>	<p>Applicant(s) FUKSHIMA ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner Minchul Yang</p>	<p>Art Unit 2891</p>	

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 07 August 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: _____.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see continuation sheet.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

/Minh-Loan T. Tran/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2826

1. The IDS filed on 08/22/08 has been considered.
2. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/07/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reasons.

(a) Applicant argues that Poicus teaches different stamping material, temperature, and pressure conditions from those of the instant invention. Applicant further argues that Examiner has not provided any factual evidence which reasonably shows that the pressure ranges utilized in the methods of Poicus achieve a recognized result.

However, the Poicus reference is cited in the Final action to provide evidence of a known method of forming an uneven structure on the top of an LED using a molding technique. Okazaki and Babich teach the material (silicon organic solvent material) as claimed (see page 5 in the Final office action). Examiner notes that the temperature condition on which the Applicant's argument relied was not stated in the claims. Regarding the pressure ranges as claimed, The Final Office action established a sufficient reasoning of why a stamping pressure condition is a result-effective parameter to determine a final structure of a molded pattern, and thus subject to optimization. Applicant has not provided a sufficient reasoning or evidence to refute the Examiner's argument. Furthermore, the Examiner's reasoning is supported by various references. For instance, Chou teaches the molding technique of the instant invention using PMMA under a stamping pressure in a range 600-1900 psi (= 4.2-13.3 MPa: page 4129, col. 2, last paragraph), which overlaps the claimed range (5-150 MPa). Chou further teaches in the same paragraph that the stamping temperature and pressure depend on the molded material used. Hirai teaches the molding technique of the instant invention using PMMA under stamping pressures of 30, 60, 90 MPa (figure 6). Hirai further analyzes in detail how the stamping pressure affects the final structure of the molded material (see, e.g., Introduction, figures 2-6, and Result and Discussions).

(b) Applicant argues that combining the methods of the references would not have been obvious due to differences in the temperature and pressure conditions between the references. However, Examiner notes that "The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference.... Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of those references would have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981): see also MPEP 2145.